## 

1	WESLEY E. OVERSON (CA SBN 154737) WOverson@mofo.com			
2	DANIEL P. MUINO (CA SBN 209624) DMuino@mofo.com			
3	DAISY DANIELLE COLEMAN (CA SBN 248456)			
4	DColeman@mofo.com MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP			
5	425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105-2482			
6	Telephone: 415.268.7000 Facsimile: 415.268.7522			
7	Attorneys for Defendant			
8	BAYER CORPORATION			
9				
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION			
13				
14	SAN FRANCISCO TECHNOLOGY INC.,	Case No.: CV10-00966 JF PVT		
15	Plaintiff,	Judge: Hon. Jeremy Fogel Date: July 8, 2010		
16	V.	Time: 1:30 p.m. Courtroom: 3, 5th Floor		
17	THE GLAD PRODUCTS COMPANY, BAJER	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL		
	DESIGN & MARKETING INC., BAYER CORPORATION, BRIGHT IMAGE	NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT BAYER		
18	CORPORATION, CHURCH & DWIGHT CO.	CORPORATION'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STAY		
19	INC., COLGATE-PALMOLIVE COMPANY, COMBE INCORPORATED, THE DIAL			
20	CORPORATION, EXERGEN CORPORATION, GLAXOSMITHKLINE LLC, HI-TECH	Complaint Filed: March 5, 2010		
21	PHARMACAL CO. INC., JOHNSON PRODUCTS COMPANY INC., MAYBELLINE			
22	LLC, MCNEIL-PPC INC., MEDTECH PRODUCTS INC., PLAYTEX PRODUCTS			
23	INC., RECKITT BENCKISER INC., ROCHE DIAGNOSTICS CORPORATION,			
24	SOFTSHEEN-CARSON LLC, SUN PRODUCTS CORPORATION, SUNSTAR AMERICAS INC.,			
25	Defendants.			
26				
27				
28				
	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF BAYER'S REPLY CASE NO. CV10-00966 JF PVT sf-2860424			

1	Defendant Bayer Corporation ("Bayer") requests that this Court take judicial notice of the		
2	following exhibits under Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence in connection with Bayer's		
3	Reply in Support of its Motion to Stay:		
4	RJN8 — Attached as Exhibit H is a true and correct copy of an Order dated June 9, 2010		
5	in the case of <i>Hungerpiller v. Energizer Holdings</i> , <i>Inc.</i> , No. 2:10-cv-290-AKK, slip op.		
6	(N.D. Ala. June 9, 2010) (Kallon, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the		
7	Federal Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-		
8	1430, 2009-1453.		
9	RJN9 — Attached as Exhibit I is a true and correct copy of an Order dated June 9, 2010,		
10	in the case of Englehardt v. Costco Wholesale Corp., No. 1:10-cv-01424, minute entry (N.D. Ill.		
11	June 9, 2010) (Kocoras, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the Federal		
12	Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-1430,		
13	2009-1453.		
14	RJN10 — Attached as Exhibit J is a true and correct copy of a Minute Entry dated		
15	June 3, 2010, in the case of Simonian v. Mead Westvaco Corp., No. 1:10-cv-01217, minute entry		
16	(N.D. Ill. June 3, 2010) (Castillo, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the		
17	Federal Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-		
18	1430, 2009-1453.		
19	RJN11 — Attached as Exhibit K is a true and correct copy of a Minute Entry dated		
20	June 2, 2010, in the case of Simonian v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., No. 1:10-cv-01214, minute entry		
21	(N.D. Ill. June 2, 2010) (Kocoras, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the		
22	Federal Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-		
23	1430, 2009-1453.		
24	RJN12 — Attached as Exhibit L is a true and correct copy of an Order dated		
25	May 24, 2010, in the case of O & G SearchQuest, Inc. v. McNeill-PPC, Inc., No. H-10-1004, slip		
26	op. (S.D. Tex. May 24, 2010) (Atlas, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the		
27	Federal Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-		
28	1430, 2009-1453.		
	REOUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF BAYER'S REPLY		

1	RJN13 — Attached as Exhibit M is a true and correct copy of an Order dated		
2	May 20, 2010, in the case of <i>Hollander v. B. Braun Medical, Inc.</i> , No. 10-835, slip op. (E.D. Pa.		
3	May 20, 2010) (McLaughlin, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the Federal		
4	Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-1430,		
5	2009-1453.		
6	<u>RJN14</u> — Attached as <u>Exhibit N</u> is a true and correct copy of a Minute Entry dated		
7	May 18, 2010, in the case of <i>Heathcote Holdings Corp. v. Clorox Co.</i> , No. 1:10-cv-00942, minute		
8	entry (N.D. Ill. May 18, 2010) (Norgle, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of		
9	the Federal Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428,		
10	2009-1430, 2009-1453.		
11	RJN15 — Attached as Exhibit O is a true and correct copy of an Order dated		
12	May 17, 2010, in the case of O & G SearchQuest, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co., No. H-10-1164,		
13	slip op. (S.D. Tex. May 17, 2010) (Atlas, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of		
14	the Federal Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428,		
15	2009-1430, 2009-1453.		
16	RJN16 — Attached as Exhibit P is a true and correct copy of an Order dated		
17	May 17, 2010, in the case of Hirschhorn v. Church & Dwight Co, No. 2:10-cv-1156-JF, slip op.		
18	(E.D. Pa. May 17, 2010) (Fullam, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the		
19	Federal Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-		
20	1430, 2009-1453.		
21	RJN17 — Attached as Exhibit Q is a true and correct copy of a Minute Entry dated		
22	May 14, 2010, in the case of Simonian v. L'Oreal USA Creative, Inc., No. 10 C 1345, minute		
23	entry (N.D. Ill. May 14, 2010) (Coar, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the		
24	Federal Circuit appeal in Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc., Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-		
25	1430, 2009-1453.		
26	RJN18 — Attached as Exhibit R is a true and correct copy of an Order dated		
27	May 13, 2010, in the case of Creston Elec., Inc. v. Lutron Elec. Co., No. 10-01390, slip op.		
28	(D. N.J. May 13, 2010) (Cavanaugh, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the		
	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF BAYER'S REPLY CASE NO. CV10-00966 JF PVT sf-2860424		

Federal Circuit appeal in *Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc.*, Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-1430, 2009-1453.

RJN19 — Attached as Exhibit S is a true and correct copy of an Order dated May 6, 2010, in the case of *Hollander v. Hospira, Inc.*, No. 10-235, slip op. (E.D. Pa. May 6, 2010) (Dubois, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the Federal Circuit appeal in *Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc.*, Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-1430, 2009-1453.

<u>RJN20</u> — Attached as <u>Exhibit T</u> is a true and correct copy of an Order dated May 5, 2010, in the case of *Hollander v. Timex Group USA, Inc.*, No. 10-429, slip op. (E.D. Pa. May 5, 2010) (Schiler, J.), which stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the Federal Circuit appeal in *Stauffer v. Brooks Bros. Inc.*, Fed. Cir. Appeal Nos. 2009-1428, 2009-1430, 2009-1453.

"A court shall take judicial notice if requested by a party and supplied with the necessary information." Fed. R. Evid. 201(d). A fact is judicially noticeable if it is "not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is . . . capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot be questioned." Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)(2). Courts regularly take judicial notice, under Rule 201, of judgments, orders, actions, records and oral argument transcripts from other courts because such facts are capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to reliable sources. *See, e.g., Engine Mfrs. Ass'n v. S. Coast Air Quality Mgmt. Dist.*, 498 F.3d 1031, 1039 n.2 (9th Cir. 2007) (taking judicial notice of oral argument transcript); *Holder v. Holder*, 305 F.3d 854, 866 (9th Cir. 2002) (taking judicial notice of a state court decision and the briefs filed in that court); *Conopco, Inc. v. Roll Int'l*, 231 F.3d 82, 86 n.3 (2nd Cir. 2000) (taking judicial notice of judgment and Notice of Appeal from related state court action); *Mike's Train House, Inc. v. Lionel, LLC*, 472 F.3d 398, 411-12 (6th Cir. 2006) (citing a string of authorities that have taken judicial notice of judgment and/or records from other cases).

Here, Bayer's request for judicial notice of the orders and minute entries attached hereto should be granted because the documents are matters of public record and are capable of accurate and ready verification by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot be questioned.

## 

1	Dated: June 24, 2010	Respectfully submitted,
2		By: <u>/s/ Daniel P. Muino</u>
3		WESLEY E. OVERSON
4		DANIEL P. MUINO DAISY DANIELLE COLEMAN
5		
6		Attorneys for Defendant BAYER CORPORATION
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF BAYER'S REPLY CASE NO. CV10-00966 JF PVT  $_{\rm sf-2860424}$